

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is a continuation application filed under 37 C.F.R. §1.53(b). This application is a continuation application of co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/290,852 filed November 8, 2002. This application claims priority to U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/290,852.

Claims 6, 7, 18, and 19 have been canceled. Claims 8, 17, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-5, 8-17, 20, and 21 are active in the application.

In the parent application, Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamekuni, et al.

Tamekuni, et al. was cited for disclosing, in Figures 10-14 therein, a device having two optical fibers 400 and a body 100. The Office Action of September 8, 2003, in the parent case, acknowledges that the Tamekuni, et al. reference “does not specify the length of the fibers to be 50mm.” However, the Office Action takes the position that the “applicant did not recite, why such length is required and as such it is matter of design choice to make the length to be 50mm in order to provide adequate length of the optical fiber.”

Applicants’ specification at paragraphs [0005] and [0006] note that the optical fibers of the flex circuit are directly terminated with the ferrule which entails much labor. Applicants’ invention is a device that allows the ferrule to be completed in one location, and then, as needed, the optical fibers of the ferrule can be fused or spliced to the optical fibers of the circuit such as a flex circuit. The last sentence of paragraph [0031] of Applicants’ specification notes that the length of the optical fibers 20-31 is less than fifty millimeters. Furthermore, Applicants’

paragraph [0032] states that the device 11 of Figures 2 and 3 can be mass produced and stored in large quantities. The device 11 allows for the low cost production of high quality terminations which are traditionally time consuming and expensive to make.

Claim 1 recites that the optical fibers have a length "being less than fifty millimeters." The prior art of record does not disclose such a feature. Therefore, Applicants believe that Claim 1 defines over the prior art of record.

The same arguments as set forth above apply to rejected Claims 2-5, which depend from Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants believe that Claims 2-5 define over the prior art of record.

Filed herewith is an INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT and form PTO-1449.

Filed herewith is a LETTER TRANSMITTING COPY OF OATH OR DECLARATION and a copy of the oath or declaration as filed in the parent case.

The above changes to the claims are self-evident from the original disclosure. Therefore, it is believed that no new matter has been introduced.

Respectfully submitted,

"Express Mail" number: EL 807927785-US

Date of Deposit: September 19, 2003

I hereby certify that this paper and/or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" under 37 CFR §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to:

Mail Stop Patent Application
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

By Karl D. Kovach
Karl D. Kovach
Reg. No.: 40,278

Stratos Lightwave, Inc.
Attorney for Applicants
7444 West Wilson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60706
(708) 867-9600

Karl D. Kovach